

Annual audit of performance management: teaching and support staff

Support Staff Member	Are/Were targets consistent with the level of role?	Are/Were targets SMART?	Is there a link between targets and the school/residential care improvement plan?	Is/Has a range of evidence to be considered in making the judgement?	Are job accountabilities in role profile being used?	If reviewing after interim/end of year review, is there evidence of clear and two way dialogue regarding performance?	Are/Were training needs documented and met (if applicable)?
A LSA1	Yes	Individual contribution not defined (see comments)	Yes and referenced	Yes.	Yes	Yes. Reviewer and reviewee comments for each stage.	Dates identified but not yet reached as mid year
B LSA/IT	Yes	Ongoing rather than specific	Yes and referenced	Yes.	Yes	Yes	Needs not itemised but evidence included in file
C LSA3	Yes	Yes	Yes but reference incomplete for 3 rd target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
D SRCCW	Yes	Ongoing rather than specific to year.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, but recorded by reviewer	Yes
E SRCCW	Yes	Could be better (see comments)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes but recorded by reviewer	Yes
F Managerial	Yes	Could be better (see comments)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Teaching Staff Member	Are/Were targets consistent with the level of role?	Are/Were targets SMART?	Is there a link between targets and the school/residential care improvement plan?	Is/Has a range of evidence to be considered in making the judgement?	Are Teachers Standards being used?	If reviewing after interim/end of year review, is there evidence of clear and two way dialogue regarding performance?	Are/Were training needs documented and met (if applicable)?
A TLR2 & 3	Yes	Yes, with success criteria and milestones	Yes but not enumerated	Yes, very specific	Yes and linked to evidence	Yes, clear and focused	Yes in CPD objective
B TLR2 & 3	Yes	Yes, with success criteria and milestones	Yes but not enumerated	Yes, good pupil focus	Yes	Yes, clear and focused	Yes in CPD objective
C Teacher	Yes	Yes, with success criteria and milestones	Yes, enumerated in evidence column	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes in training needs section
D TLR2	Yes	Yes, with success criteria and milestones.	Yes enumerated in objective column	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes in CPD objective
E Managerial	Yes	Yes, with success criteria and milestones	Yes, defined in objectives	Yes	Leadership standards	Section missing or N/A	Yes in CPD objective
F Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, very detailed	Yes	N/A	Yes in CPD objective

Comments

Six support staff files and six teaching staff files were examined. The files sampled for both support staff and teaching staff show that the performance management process continues to be used systematically and in line with our policy. The forms used are the models supplied by Education Personnel Services.

The evidence provided in the files is generally commensurate with the level of post occupied by the individuals, ie. less material provided

by lower grades of support staff compared with that provided by teaching and managerial staff. The evidence in the support staff folders was sufficient in range and quality to demonstrate achievement, whereas teaching folders tended to contain more than was necessary. It might help reduce the work for teacher reviewees and reviewers if evidence was limited to that which was most relevant to the specific targets for the year and the individual concerned, rather than including generic documents (eg. SIP, Course materials, Safeguarding guidance etc.). Some reviews demonstrate careful consideration at the outset of what specific evidence will be required for each objective and this is very helpful.

In the support staff reviews, the column setting out how a target would be measured was often better proof of a SMART target than what was written in the "target" column eg. Target: "ensuring X is running effectively". How will it be measured: "pupil output records, staff getting necessary information, X assessment completed". So the real SMART target was something like "ensure staff have necessary information and use X assessment to increase pupil output compared to previous records". It might therefore be useful for support staff reviewers/reviewees to be asked to try using the evidence column to help them SMARTen the targets set at the beginning of the year, and see if it helps. It isn't easy to set good yearly targets for support staff posts and it is obvious from the forms that people are more comfortable when dealing with the job accountabilities and the evidence for these. Although the targets set for support staff were all relevant to the SIP, numerical references were not always given. In two forms the reviewee's comments had apparently been recorded by the reviewer rather than being entered by the individuals. Unless this was in response to the reviewees' needs, it would have been better to encourage the reviewees to complete the section on their own. There were a few minor errors in the completion of the forms such as an incorrect date in one and a signature missing in another but, overall, the folders show a process which is consistently applied and having a real impact on the performance of staff.

In the teaching staff reviews, the use of success criteria and milestones has sharpened their targets and it is noticeable how the process has become much more focussed on pupil outcomes than it was when we first started doing these audits. All targets were relevant to the SIP although there was a variation in whether or not numerical references were given and in which columns. Training needs were addressed in all reviews but there was some confusion about where to record them. Four reviewers dealt with them in the targets section through a CPD objective, one used the training needs section and one used both. The forms don't make it clear how this is best done so management may wish to consider what they see as the appropriate use (CPD for personal development, training needs section for support to achieve professional standards/skills?). As with the support staff, there were some errors in completion of the forms but some of these were more important. Three reviewers had not completed the performance rating and points section. One reviewer had completed this but not the assessment against objectives column. In one form the reviewer/reviewee comments section was not completed. We know from the information supplied by the headteacher in relation to pay awards that the performance of these individuals was assessed and a rating given but the forms should really show that too.

Recommendations

Staff should be congratulated on the thoroughness with which the performance management process is carried out in the school. Folders showed that at all levels the process is taken seriously, individual contributions to pupil outcomes are valued and continuing development is expected. It would be good for managers to use the best practice which exists to tighten up the paperwork, so that all records equal the standard of other aspects of the process. Thank you to Barry and Gary for the work involved in providing the anonymised folders. I believe the PM process is now so securely embedded in the school that, unless anything changes, future audits can look at teaching staff and support staff on alternate years and a maximum of six folders can be supplied.

Date audit completed: 22 February 2018

Signed:

Name of governor: Hazel Round